

HB 6781 AN ACT ADDRESSING HOUSING AFFORDABILITY FOR RESIDENTS IN THE STATE.

Senator Moore, Representative Luxenberg, Ranking members Sen. Sampson Rep. Scott, and honorable members of the Housing Committee;

I URGE YOU TO OPPOSE THIS BILL:

IT IMPOSES EXTRAORDINARY HIGH PENALTY FEE WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION:

1. Creates an extraordinary fine level without establishing a fee schedule.
 - a. Such a large fine potential should only be applicable where gross negligence of duty and care are exhibited.
 - b. As written, a \$2000 fine could be levied;
 - i. For a cracked ceiling tile or some non-life threatening condition,
 - ii. Without consideration of the potential for tenant caused issues,
 - iii. Upon a landlord actively trying to remedy hazards.

IT ELIMINATES LAPSE OF TIME EVICTIONS:

1. Removes the ability for landlords to pursue a “lapse of time” eviction if a tenant fails to vacate a unit after their lease has ended. This forces a landlord to maintain a lease in perpetuity that they may not want for any number of reasons including;
 - a. Every contract must be allowed to expire if either party chooses to.
 - b. No other business entity is forced to continue an unwanted lease.
 - c. This bill removes prohibits taking possession of a unit lease end to;
 - i. Conduct substantial repairs or improvements
 - ii. Affect sale of the building
 - iii. Provide housing assistance to a family member.
 - iv. Terminate a lease with a nuisance tenant.
2. This bill assumes that eviction of a nuisance tenant is an option, it is not because;
 - a. Nuisance does not rise to the level of violation or lease necessary for a just cause eviction.
 - b. Requires mounds of objective documented 3rd party substantiation.
 - c. Often requires other tenants to testify against the problem tenant.
 - d. Requires extensive history of nuisance.
 - e. 3rd party testimony or reports are difficult to obtain usually due to:
 - i. intimidation by the nuisance tenant
 - ii. lack of police support for involvement in a civil matter.
3. From personal experience with nuisance tenants I can attest to nearly losing good tenants in other units because of one nuisance tenancy. For this reason alone, housing providers must be able to move forward with “no-cause” evictions.

CORRECTED VERSION!

4. Housing providers must not be bound to provide housing in perpetuity, having no ability to terminate nuisance tenancy.
5. Removes the ability for a landlord to let a lease expire without an option to renew the lease.

IT CREATES A “PROTECTED” CLASS CITIZEN WHERE SUCH IS UNNECESSARY:

This bill creates another “protected” class of citizens, those with an eviction record older than five years and by doing so:

- a. Disallows reasonable consideration of the eviction record details.
- b. Risks a CHRO fine against a landlord by an applicant for a dubious discrimination claim.

MOST IMPORTANTLY:

THE ABOVE PROVISIONS **WILL NOT** IMPROVE CONNECTICUT’S HOUSING NEEDS!

THE ABOVE PROVISIONS WILL NOT INCREASE OR PROMOTE THE INCREASE OF THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS AVAILABLE IN CT!

THE ABOVE PROVISIONS WILL NOT MAKE RENTAL HOUSING MORE AFFORDABLE.

THE ABOVE PROVISIONS PRESUME THE ONLY BAD ACTORS IN A TENANT – LANDLORD RELATIONSHIP ARE THE LANDLORDS. GIVEN THE NUMBER OF FOR CAUSE EVICTIONS EACH YEAR, THIS IS OBVIOUSLY NOT TRUE

.
AS SUCH, I URGE YOU TO OPPOSE THIS BILL.

Respectfully,

Paul Januszewski, Housing Provider

And,

President, Greater Enfield Landlords Association